



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/534,309	03/23/2000	Yoshinori Ohta	4-165US-FF	9768

21254 7590 10/20/2004  
MCGINN & GIBB, PLLC  
8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD  
SUITE 200  
VIENNA, VA 22182-3817

EXAMINER
----------

CAMPBELL, JOSHUA D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2179

DATE MAILED: 10/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/534,309	<b>Applicant(s)</b> OHTA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Joshua D Campbell	<b>Art Unit</b> 2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 July 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to communications: Request for Continued Examination filed on 07/08/2004.
2. Claims 1-6 are pending in this case. Claims 1 and 6 are independent claims. Claims 1 and 4-6 have been amended.
3. The rejection of claims 1 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vanderpool et al. has been withdrawn in view of amendments.
4. The rejection of claims 2-5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vanderpool et al. in view of Rowe et al. has been withdrawn in view of amendments.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 1, 3, 5, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vanderpool et al. (US Patent Number 5,781,773, issued on July 14, 1998) in view of Yang et al. (US Patent Number 6,301,586, filed on October 6, 1997).**

6. **Regarding independent claims 1 and 6**, Vanderpool et al. discloses a system that displays searched items in a database (column 3, lines 21-24 of Vanderpool et al.). Vanderpool et al. discloses two tables contained within a database, one of these tables

contains the full data items and user inputs including terms of search for the data items, while the other table contains parts of the full data items that are to be displayed, also field names are displayed and listed as a part of the table (Figure 5 and column 6, lines 34-44 of Vanderpool et al.). This database is accessed by using a computer implemented searching system which shows the results on a display apparatus (column 3, lines 21-24 of Vanderpool et al.). This system has the ability to access the databases and thus can be thought of as a read-out device for all elements and tables contained within the database.

Vanderpool et al. does not disclose a system in which the relational database uses three tables for the search and display system. However, the table driven database disclosed by Vanderpool et al. has the same functionality as the applicants' invention. There is no functional difference between one table that contains two delineated data types and two tables that contain only one type each. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used three tables in the database for the display system of Vanderpool et al. because the table disclosed by Vanderpool et al. which contains the full data items and the user inputs acts as a double-table.

Vanderpool et al. also does not disclose a method in which the user may order the data in the tables. However, Yang et al. discloses a method in which a user may sort the data in the tables by user specified criteria (column 6, line 59-column 7, line 17 of Yang et al.). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the methods of Vanderpool et al. with the

method of Yang et al. because it would have allowed for a simpler way to organize data in a way the user wanted.

7. **Regarding dependent claims 3 and 5**, both claims 3 and 5 of the applicant's disclosure entail nothing more than the ability to add data to a table in a relational database. Vanderpool et al. does not disclose the ability to add items in the data tables of the database. However, Yang et al. discloses a method of editing items in tables of a database. Editing abilities include adding, deleting, and sorting items contained within the tables of a relational database (column 6, line 59-column 7, line 17 of Yang et al.). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have used the method of Yang et al. applied into the system of Vanderpool et al. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art because it would have allowed the user to interact with the database in a way that is common practice in the art.

**Claims 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vanderpool et al. (US Patent Number 5,781,773, issued on July 14, 1998) in view of Yang et al. (US Patent Number 6,301,586, filed on October 6, 1997) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Rowe et al. (US Patent Number 6,466,941, filed on April 21, 1998).**

8. **Regarding dependent claims 2 and 4**, both of the claims 2 and 4 of the applicant's disclosure entail nothing more than the ability to edit data in a table in a relational database. Neither Vanderpool et al. nor Yang et al. disclose the ability to edit items in the data tables of the database. However, Rowe et al. discloses a method of

editing items in tables of a database. Editing abilities include adding, deleting, and modifying items contained within the tables of a relational database (column 16, line 50-65 of Rowe et al.). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have used the method of Rowe et al. applied into the system of Vanderpool et al. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art because it would have allowed the user to interact with the database in a way that is common practice in the art.

### ***Response to Arguments***

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

US Patent Number 6,249,772

US Patent Number 6,421,675

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joshua D Campbell whose telephone number is (571) 272-4133. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00 AM - 4:30 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on (571) 272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JDC  
October 13, 2004



SANJIV SHAH  
PRIMARY EXAMINER